

File No-P.17024/15/2024-RC (FMS-386916)

Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development
Rural Connectivity (RC) Division


Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 10th January, 2024

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Subject: Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Madhya Pradesh under PM-JANMAN, Batch-I of 2023-24 -reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on **9th January, 2024 at 12:00 Noon** under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA through video conferencing (VC) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Madhya Pradesh under **PM-JANMAN, Batch-I of 2023-24.**

2. State is requested to submit the compliance on the observations made during the meeting to the Ministry/NRIDA at the earliest.


(K.M. Singh)
Director (RC)
Tel: 011-23070308

Distribution:

- i. Principal Secretary, Panchayat & Rural Development Department, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh Email: psprd@mp.gov.in
- ii. CEO, M.P. Rural Road Development Agency Block-2 Floor-5, Parayawas Bhawan Bhopal. Email: ceomprda@gmail.com
- iii. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001.

Copy to:-

PPS to JS (RC)

Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 9th January, 2024 to consider the Project Proposal submitted by Government of Madhya Pradesh under PM JANMAN, Batch- I, 2023-24.

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held on 9th January, 2024 under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC), Department of Rural Development & DG, NRIDA to discuss the project proposal **submitted by the State of Madhya Pradesh** under PM-JANMAN, Batch I of 2023-24. The following Officers were present in the meeting:

Representatives from Government of India	
Shri Amit Shukla	Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA
Shri K.M. Singh	Director (RC)
Shri Rajeev Rana	Under Secretary (RC)
Smt. Asha Wahane	Section Officer (RC)
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P-I), NRIDA
Shri I.K.Pateriya	Consultant Director(P.III)
Shri Shalini Das	Joint Director (Tech.)
Shri Vishal Srivastava	Director ICT
Representatives from Govt. of Madhya Pradesh	
Ms. Tanvi Sundriyal	CEO, MPRRDA
Shri M.L Dabar	E-in-C, MPRRDA
Shri S D Pendse	CGM, MPRRDA
Shri Govind Pancholi	ITNO, MPRRDA
Shri Harish Sharma	GM (OIC), MPRRDA

2. Current Proposal by the State:

A detailed presentation on the proposal submitted by the State of Madhya Pradesh under Batch-I of 2023-24 was made by Ms. Shalini Das, Joint Director (Tech.), NRIDA before the Pre-Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:

Item	As per OMMAS dated 09.01.2024			
	No	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)
Roads	128	344.34	290.45	84.35
Central share:- 171.11 Cr.		State Share:- 119.33 Cr.		

7 roads having 3.00 m width – 71.75 km - Rs. 107.20 Lakhs/km

121 roads having 3.75 m width – 272.59 km - Rs. 78.33 Lakhs/km

It was informed that out of the initial list of 2954 of MoTA, 276 habitations were identified for the State. Out of it 8 habitations have less than 100 populations. Hence the balance eligible habitations are 268. Out of these 268 habitations, 49 are already connected by PMGSY roads and 39 by the PWD/ other state roads and 2 roads have land issues. Hence State has proposed 128 roads for coverage of 172 habitations. LSBs will be proposed in the next batch.

- i. All the road proposals have been duly scrutinized by STA. PTA scrutiny is yet to be done. It was seen that all the proposals were not uploaded on Geo Sadak. State was requested to ensure it immediately. Tech Division, NRIDA was requested to check the alignment of all these roads on Geo Sadak and make its recommendations.
- ii. Tech Division, NRIDA was requested to incorporate road wise details of habitations targeted for connectivity in the PPT before EC.
- iii. State is to report clearly road wise hindrances (Forest/ land issues) which may affect the execution of road work and further delay the connectivity to habitations. ICT Division, NRIDA is to ensure creation of appropriate fields in the proposal so that forest clearance requirements and progress are linked to PARIVESH.
- iv. The details of transect walk and its outcome has to be incorporated by the State in all DPRs. These should be ensured prior to the EC meeting.
- v. NRIDA should do the planning audit of all the roads before EC meeting. State should identify the locations of these roads where they are terminating in the village/ habitations areas or nearest to any facility. The connectivity of terminating point to an existing facility to be brought out clearly in the planning audit.
- vi. State was advised to examine adopting new technology under New Technology Vision as per MoRD specifications.
- vii. State should get the LSB proposals vetted from State design cell/ IIT.
- viii. ICT Division, NRIDA is to ensure printout of proposal from OMMAS for placing before EC.
- ix. State proposed some roads with 3.00 m carriageway width and 6.0 m roadway width due to land issues. Detailed justification for the deviation in the roadway width and the carriageway width is to be submitted before the EC.

3. Planning Audit (Proposals)

- Out of 128 road proposals, 21 have been successfully uploaded by state onto GEOSADAK. NRIDA has audited all 21 proposals on GeoSadak, 2 proposals found to be unsatisfactory.

The flagged proposals are given as under:

PACKAGE	District Name	Block	WORK NAME	TOTAL LENGTH	NO OF CDWORKS	CARRIAGE WIDTH	TRAFFIC NAME	AVG. COST / KM	EXT. C/WAY WIDTH
MP40PMJM001	Shivpuri	Kolaras	L094-T010 to Kudapadon via Ruhani, sherguda, Dargawa	14.8	16	3.75	T4	62.94	3

Planning Audit Observation: The PMGSY plans to offer single-road connectivity exclusively. However, double connectivity is being suggested for PVTG Habitation. State was requested to re-examine the proposal.

PACKAGE	District Name	Block	WORK NAME	TOTAL LENGTH	NO OF CDWORKS	CARRIAGE WIDTH	TRAFFIC NAME	AVG. COST / KM	EXT. C/WAY WIDTH
MP37PMJM001	Sheopur	Seopurkalan	L101-Jwalapur Bhikhapur road to Bhikapur adiwasi basti	1.74	4	3.75	T4	89.03	3

Planning Audit Observation: The PVTG Habitation mentioned in the proposal appears to be already have connectivity with the PMGSY-I Road. State was requested to re-examine it.

4. Length wise proposal details:

Length-wise details of proposal are as follows:

Length wise proposal details						
Length of road (in km)	Nos.	Length in km	Pavement cost crores	Avg Pav Cost/km	Total cost in crores	Avg total cost/km
0 – 1	21	15.49	8.79	56.79	12.65	81.71
1 - 2	35	50.104	27.83	55.54	40.11	80.07
2 – 3	42	98.005	56.56	57.71	78.96	80.57
3 – 4	14	47.374	26.83	56.64	37.03	78.18
4 – 5	5	21.95	12.63	57.57	16.54	75.37
Above 5	11	111.42	65.71	58.98	105.12	94.35
Total	128	344.34	198.37	57.61	290.45	84.34

State is to give justification as to why 11 roads having length more than 5 km have high cost. This should be given in tabular form with district-wise increase with respect to previously sanctioned roads.

5. Distribution of roads based on Traffic Category:-

Traffic	3 m carriageway width				
	Nos	Length in km	Avg Pav Cost/km	Avg. Non-Pav. Cost/km	Avg Total cost/km
T4	7	71.75	64.57	42.63	107.20
Total	7	71.75	64.57	42.63	107.20

Traffic	3.75 m carriageway width				
	Nos	Length in km	Avg Pav Cost/km	Avg. Non-Pav. Cost/km	Avg Total cost/km
T4	111	243.583	55.36	27.18	78.00
T5	8	22.71	54.76	21.75	76.50
T9	2	6.3	75.54	22.48	98.02
Total	128	344.34	55.78	26.74	78.33

State was asked to re-examine the above cited 2 roads of T9 category with average cost/km being Rs.98.02 lakh.

It was decided that all roads having high pavement/ non pavement cost would be examined and cost would be rationalized. In case the cost is not coming down after rationalization, the detailed justifications should be brought out clearly indicating the reasons for high cost vis a vis previously sanctioned PMGSY/RCPLWEA roads. It was decided to send the teams of NQM for site inspections of some of such proposals

6. District wise details of current proposals :

District wise details of current proposals						
Sl No	District	3 m width road				
		No	Length in km	Pavement cost/km	Non-Pavement Cost/km	Total cost/km
1	Balaghat	1	9.7	47.32	41.13	88.45
2	Dindori	1	0.95	53.45	26.05	79.50
3	Narsinghpur	5	61.1	67.48	43.13	110.61
	Total	7	71.75	64.57	42.63	107.20

District wise details of current proposals						
Sl No	District	3.75 m width road				
		No	Length in km	Pavement cost/km	Non-Pavement Cost/km	Total cost/km
1	Anuppur	14	29.39	60.16	17.09	77.25
2	Ashok Nagar	2	2.56	53.94	51.52	105.46
3	Balaghat	10	28.71	54.27	24.57	78.84
4	Datia	2	2.4	52.89	20.53	73.42
5	Dindori	19	46.78	56.90	24.33	83.93
6	Guna	4	11.26	57.59	37.79	95.38
7	Gwalior	10	14.87	56.58	23.82	80.40
8	Mandla	14	37.01	52.31	18.75	71.06
9	Morena	1	2.1	54.67	20.98	75.65
10	Satna	1	2.85	70.01	15.54	85.55
11	Shahdol	23	38.52	53.94	19.41	73.35
12	Sheopur	2	5.36	57.24	42.25	99.49
13	Shivpuri	6	23.32	53.36	19.43	72.79
14	Sidhi	13	27.46	57.62	23.03	80.65
	Grand Total	121	1.55	57.61	26.74	84.35

State was requested to give justification with respect to proposals having higher non-pavement cost/km.

7. (i) Pavement cost/km wise details:

The details of proposals are as under:-

Pavement cost/ km wise details			
Sl No	Pavement cost/km	No of roads	
		3 m	3.75
1	Less than 60	5	91
2	60-82	2	30
	Total	7	121

State was asked to furnish proper justification with regard to higher pavement cost more than 70 lakh in the table above. Tech Division, NRIDA should examine the high pavement cost of these roads .

(ii) Non pavement cost/km wise details:

The details of proposals are as under:

Non Pavement cost/ km wise details			
Sl No	Non Pavement cost/km	No of roads	
		3 m	3.75 m
1	Less than 20	1	52
4	40-58	6	69
	Total	7	121

NRIDA should examine the high non pavement cost > 40 lakh of 72 roads.

8. General observations:

- The State submitted that any costs over and above Rs. 1 Cr/ Km ceiling will be borne by the State.
- The State requested for consideration of OGPC technology in place of 20 mm MSS as they are experienced in the technology and the sites are in interior areas where extra efforts would be required for supervision of MSS technology. The State was requested to consider the benefits from MSS technology and consider adopting it. The State agreed to propose for part of the proposal for MSS technology.
- Hard shoulder needs to be proposed for 100mm thickness and 1m wide on both side same needs to be corrected on DPR.
- State needs to submit the ATCC report for proposals above 1 MSA to NRIDA.
- **State has provided rigid pavement in large lengths. The State responded that certain sites have stream flows which require rigid pavement for preventing damage to the pavement. State was requested to re-examine the requirements around habitation areas.**
- Cement concrete pavement was proposed of 7.5 m width and 200 mm thickness, it is to be panelled cement concrete of 100mm/ 120 mm thickness for rationalizing the costs.
- Cost of utility shifting should be taken under higher specification head.

State was requested to furnish the inputs on priority.

9. Maintenance

State has proposed Rs. 11.49 lakh for 5 years Routine maintenance, which is 3.96 % of the construction cost, which is on the lower side. Similarly, for 6th year renewal cost is Rs. 23.33 lakh, which is of 8.03% of the construction cost, which is on the lower side.

10. Pre-Empowered Committee asked the State to send the compliance on all the observations mentioned in the foregoing paras so that EC meeting for sanctioning of the proposal could be conducted at an early date.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to and from the Chair.
